DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 580 EA 023 094

AUTHOR Gougeon, Thomas D.
TITLE Cross Gender Effects in Principal-Teacher Communication: Using Survey and Field Study Techniques.
SPONS AGENCY Central Washington Univ., Ellensburg.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 41p.; For a replication of this study, se EA 023 093.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; *Communication (Thought Transfer); Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Interpersonal Relationship; Leadership; *Leadership Styles; Public Schools; *Sex Differences; Social Control; *Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Cross Sex Interaction; *Washington

ABSTRACT

An analysis of principal-teacher social control communication dynamics is offered in this report, with a focus on the effects of gender on such communication processes. Surveys were administered to 319 K-12 teachers in 19 Washington State schools and to 19 principals. Onsite interviews were also conducted with five principals. Findings from the field and statistical data indicate the existence of cross-gender effects on communication. Female teachers experienced male principals as significantly more discouraging, manipulating, and isolating than female principals. Female teachers experienced principal communication differently than did their male counterparts, which suggests gender-related differences. Implications are that effective communication occurs consistently at all levels of orientation--personal, official, and structural--and that the appropriate use of different types of communication is dependent upon the situation. Appendices include the teacher and principal questionnaires. (3 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333580

CROSS GENDER EFFECTS IN PRINCIPAL-TEACHER COMMUNICATION: USING SURVEY AND FIELD STUDY TECHNIQUES

Thomas D. Gougeon
University of Calgary

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Gougeon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA023094

This paper was prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois April 3 - 7, 1991.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This study was partially supported by the Faculty Research Fund and the School of Professional Studies Research Incentive Funds of Central Washington University, Ellensburg, Washington 98926.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership has captured the attention of people from all walks of life. It has been studied by Kings, Presidents, business executives, and scholars. Reviewing what has been written about leadership, it is evident that leadership progressed through increasingly more complex conceptualizations: using great leader and trait perspectives; applying scientific management, human relations, and humanist assumptions; leadership as politics suppositions; cultural orientations; and, employing situational, psycho-analytical, and attribution frameworks. Processes identified with leadership have been extensively studied such as conflict management, policy development, negotiations, and communications.

After all is said and done about leadership, learning different leadership perspectives, applying leadership assumptions, employing leadership frameworks, studying leadership processes - leaders ultimately encounter success or failure during the myriad of segmented, spontaneous, and reciprocal exchanges with followers. A portion of these exchanges are analyzed in this report; that is leader-follower social control communication dynamics as they occur between principals and teachers in the school system. In particular, the primary bases of comparison being reported here are teacher gender and principal gender.

OVERVIEW

Ddata were collected using a survey approach, asking respondents how they experienced their principal, in contrast to asking respondents how they perceived their principal. In addition, field data were collected using on-site observational techiques at selected schools. Through non parametric statistical procedures applied to the survey data the following significant findings were discovered and described using the supplementary field data. It was found that female teachers viewed male principals as being significantly more negative communicators than female principals. They experienced male principals as being significantly more discouraging, manipulating, and isolating, whereas they experienced female principals as being significantly more mentoring, supporting, and recognizing.

In contrast, male teachers did not experience male or female principals communicating differently in any statistically significant way.

The communication model applied in the study characterized social control communication with nine cells dependent upon motivational variables (intrinsic, and positive and negative extrinsic motivations) and orientational variables (personal, official, and organizational orientations) (Gougeon, Hutton, and McPherson, 1991). A survey was constructed in one-to-one correspondence with the nine cells of the model. Each cell

was represented by ten survey items that characterized how teachers felt when communicating with their principal.

Situations and feelings as experienced by 319 teachers from K-12 in 19 schools in the State of Washington were surveyed between January and April of 1990. The survey instrument asked teachers to consider communicating with their present principal and to respond by circling an appropriate number on a five-point Likert frequency scale. Teachers were asked how frequently they felt different emotions as a result of principal communication. They were also asked how frequently their principal created specific conditions or situations (See Appendix A). Principals were asked to describe their intentions in communication with teachers in a parallel survey instrument (See Appendix B). Principal data were not considered in this report.

In addition, five of the school sites were selected for further data gathering using field study activities. In these five sites, principals were "shadowed" by an observer who recorded anecdotal data of social control communications between the principal and teachers. The data were later coded to help characterize the concepts represented by the nine cells of the communication model.

BACKGROUND

The Sample

The study was conducted in Washington State. Public schools and private academies in the State were assigned numbers and 145 schools were selected using a random

sampling process. First, each school was mailed an explanatory letter. Second, a follow-up package was mailed including a cover letter, a self administration instruction booklet, a principal communication survey form, a teacher communication survey form for each teacher, and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. School staffs were asked to become involved with the study on a 100 percent commitment basis. Principals would not be present when teachers completed their forms; they would complete their own survey in the isolation of their own offices. Nineteen schools responded, seven elementary schools, four middle schools, and eight high schools. A total of 319 teachers responded to the survey representing nineteen principals; 126 male teachers, 155 female teachers (38 teacher respondents omitted the gender item), 12 male principals, and 7 female principals.

With only 19 schools responding, can a case be made to generalize findings across the population of schools in Washington State? Is the sample representative? A representative sample is not simply dependent upon the ratio of the population of schools included in the sample or on the absolute number of schools included in the sample. Generalization of findings depends upon the make-up of the sample and how closely the sample represents the population. In approximate terms, the sample is made up of half male and half female teachers, over one-third female principals, equal proportions of elementary and high schools, and half

as many middle schools. These proportions are similar to the actual ratios in the population of schools in Washington State. From this perspective, an argument of representativeness is made.

Definitions of Authority and Power

The concepts of authority and power are blurred in everyday language. Evidence of this fact is documented by Mitchell and Spady (1983) who traced the usage of the concepts from Greek and Roman times to present. The definitions of authority and power used in the social control communication theory are consistent with original Latin usage:

> "The concept of authority used in the study is the ability to manifest voluntary social control over followers because of inner character of a leader. Accordingly, those under authority act or conduct themselves in accordance to the will of those in authority and respond to the intrinsic, voluntary, and transforming character of authority.
>
> The concept of power is the ability to manifest voluntary or involuntary social control over followers because of external resources of a leader. Accordingly, those under power are coerced to behave in accordance to the will of those in power and respond to the segmented, immediate, and universal effects of power resources."
>
> (Gougeon, 1989)

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument represented nine cells of a social control communication model. The cells included Personal Authority, Personal Positive Power, and Personal Negative Power; Official Authority, Official Positive Power, and Official Negative Power; and, Organizational Authority, Organizational Positive Power, and Organizational Negative Power.

Each cell was represented by ten survey items preceded with the statement, "My principal communicates with me by..." and followed by a five-point Likert frequency scale with categories: Never/Not Applicable, Once in a While, Generally, Most Often, and All the Time. For example, an item representing the first cell, Personal Authority, was "My principal communicates with me by developing personal relationships with me.", whereas an item representing the ninth cell, Organizational Negative Power, was "My principal communicates with me by making me feel isolated from my colleagues." Cued by these items, teachers circled the appropriate frequency descriptors on the five-point scale.

The principal completed a parallel form to the teachers' survey instrument. Parallel items to the above teacher items were: "I communicate with my teachers by developing close personal relationships with them", and "I communicate with my teachers by isolating them from undesirable colleagues."

The survey instrument also included several biographical and situational items. Both teachers and principals were asked their age, gender, years of teaching experience, and whether they thought their school served a rural or urban community. Teachers were asked the number of principals they had worked with in the past, how close they felt to their present principal, the frequencies of professional and visual contacts they usually had with their principal, whether they were parents, and what subjects they taught. Principals were asked the length of their administrative experience, the grade levels in their school, the number of certified teachers in their school, the number of buildings for which they were responsible, school enrollment, and the number of years they occupied their present position.

The biographical and situational items provided a flexible basis of comparison for the communication data. The primary bases of comparison being reported in this report are teacher gender and principal gender.

The Data Gathering Process

Once school staffs were committed to completing the communication survey instrument, the instruments were either self-administered or administered by the principal investigator of the study using identical procedures. Eleven of the nineteen schools self-administered the test. Using an instruction booklet provided, a teacher aide or other non-certified staff conducted the teacher survey at a staff

meeting and returned the surveys along with the principal's completed survey by mail. The principal investigator conducted the surveys in the remaining eight schools using the identical instruction booklet as a guide.

The Statistical Procedures

The five-point Likert scales in the instrument were ranking scales. Each of the ninety items in the survey was tested for statistical significance using a non-parametric procedure, the Kruskal-Wallis 1-step ANOVA for ranked means. The Kruskal-Wallis test is similar to the Mann-Whitney test in that all cases from the gender groups were combined and ranked. Average ranks were assigned in the case of ties. For each group, the ranks were summed and the Kruskal-Wallis H statistic, which was computed from these sums, had approximately a chi-square distribution under the hypothesis that the gender groups had the same distribution (Siegel, 1956).

Aggregate variables were computed from the items into means thus converting ordinal data into interval data. This procedure was justified as means of rankings were to be compared by groups. Each cell of the communication model was represented by an aggregate variable as the mean of ten items. Means of each cell were then compared across gender groups using ANOVA procedures for interval data.

Reliability

Reliability is a concept of consistency of measurement. Threats to reliability were reduced as much as possible

given the fact that the survey elicited responses to subjective experiences of feelings and situations. A powerful strategy to reduce threats to reliability of the instrument was the creation of a family or scale of items for each concept and the comparison of the uniformity of responses to the items within the scale. Each cell of the model, represented by a scale of ten items, was tested for uniformity using Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient of Reliability. Coefficients ranged between 0.83 and 0.92, except for cell 5, Personal Negative Power which was 0.72; overall there was a satisfactory level of uniformity between items for each scale.

Another strategy reducing threats to reliability was to ensure the uniformity of conditions under which data were gathered. Each package of survey instruments had a self administration instruction booklet which was followed consistently at each testing site. Identical instructions and time allotments were given to respondent teachers at each site. The principal investigator of the study administered the instruments in an identical manner, using the booklet as a guide. Consequently, there is confidence that threats to reliability were reduced as the conditions under which teachers completed their survey were similar.

Validity

Validity is an issue of whether the survey instrument measures what is expected. In five of the nineteen school sites, the principal investigator personally shadowed the

school principal to observe social control communication interactions with teachers. Consequently qualitative anecdotal data were gathered and compared to the quantitative survey data. The qualitative observational data substantiated the quantitative survey data comparing the frequency of response scales with a tally of observed communications coded into the cells of the social control communication model. Thus, similar conclusions were drawn from two independent sources of data (Gougeon, Hutton, McPherson, 1991).

Another approach was taken to minimize threats to validity of the instrument. Two items were placed in the biographical and situational section of the teachers' survey instrument. The measure of personal communication was predicted to correlate with closeness that each respondent felt toward the principal. Accordingly, an item that measured closeness was included, "How close would you describe yourself to your principal." The measure of official communication was predicted to correlate with professionalism, and the item, "How often do you interact professionally with your principal," was included in the instrument.

Using the Kruskal-Wallis 1-Way ANOVA test for ranked means, the "closeness" item was significantly correlated with aggregate scores in the Personal Orientation cells at a probability level of 0.01. The "professional" item was found to significantly correlate with the Official Orientation

cells at a probability level of 0.01. In conclusion, the instrument appeared to measure what was intended to be measured, and threats to validity appeared to be low.

RESULTS

Item Analysis By Category

As stated above, central to this report are cross gender effects of communication between teachers and principals, or how male teachers experienced male versus female principals and how female teachers experienced male versus female principals. Ranked means of individual survey items were examined for differences by principal gender for female and male teacher groups employing the Kruskal-Wallis 1-way ANOVA test.

It was found male teachers experienced insignificant differences in communication between female principals and male principals. That is, communication was experienced by male teachers to be similar regardless of principal gender.

It was also found female teachers experienced male principals using Negative Power communication significantly more frequently than female principals. By examination, the following Negative Power items were found to be significant: Item 32 - Discouraging me from developing innovations; Item 59 - Making me aware that support for me is limited; Item 68 - Making me think that receiving a greater share of the budget depends on how well I perform in my job; Item 52 - Making me feel uncertain whether I am doing as well as others in my work; Item 61 - Making me feel unreasonably

treated; Item 36 - Making me think that my skills are not being utilized; and Item 45 - Trying to limit the amount of influence I have with my colleagues. These items represented communication which derived motivational qualities from threats to use extrinsic resources as sanctions or punishments.

The first three items were Negative Personal Power items. That is, their orientational quality was a projection of personal perspectives and standards of the principal. The next two items were Negative Official Power items. Their orientational qualities emanated from standards of the office of the principal. The Negative Official Power items drew comparisons of individual teachers with their peers. The last two items were Negative Organizational Power items. Negative Organizational Power items had orientational qualities projected by the structure of the school itself: rules, policies, regulations, routines, patterns of behaviour, norms and values; In this case, roles of teachers and social power structures.

It was found female teachers also experienced differences in authentic Authoritative communication patterns between male and female principals. The Authority items found to be statistically significant were: Item 46 - Helping me improve my work performance; Item 55 - Modeling techniques for me to follow; Item 73 - Taking time to sit down to talk with me; Item 11 - Directly acknowledging me when I contribute to the operation; Item 20 - Guiding me to

learn better work related skills; Item 12 - Making me feel acknowledged with memos or newspaper articles; Item 21 - Setting professional goals with me using written goal statements; and, Item 75 - Writing notes to me in appreciation of work well done. Fundamental to the above items were authoritative motivational characteristics. That is, teachers responded to intrinsic characteristics of their principal and were attracted by authenticity of their principals' communications.

The first three items were Personal Authority items. Their orientational quality was a result of personal perspectives and standards of the principal. The next two items were Official Authority items. Official Power's orientational qualities reflected the standards of the office of the principal, in contrast to the personal standards of the principal. The last three items were Organizational Authority items whose orientational qualities resulted from aspects of the school structure, such as memos, goal statements, and notes.

Aggregate Analysis of Categories

The ten items representing each communication cell were aggregated and cell means were then calculated. The procedure ANOVA for interval data was employed to calculate significant differences by principal gender for both male and female groups of teacher respondents. As was predicted, findings for the male teacher respondent group were insignificant. Since individual items within cells were

previously found to be insignificant, it was expected that aggregate variables derived from individual items would also be insignificant.

The group of female teacher respondents were found to experience differences between male and female principals. Significant effects were discovered in aggregate variables of two Negative Power communication cells. Female teachers experienced male principals using Official and Organizational Negative Power communication patterns significantly more frequently than female principals. In addition, comparing principals by gender with the aggregate means of thirty Negative Power items, female teachers experienced male principals to use Negative Power communication patterns significantly more frequently than female principals.

Cross Gender Effects

Cross gender communication effects between principals and teachers appeared to exist in the nineteen schools studied. The instrument distinguished communication effects between female teachers and male and female principals. Reviewing the Negative Power items where "innovation" was not encouraged, and "support" and "budget" were limited, it is interpreted that male more than female principals discouraged female teachers. Considering the Negative Power items where performance and fairness were issues, it is interpreted that male more than female principals manipulated female teachers. Finally, reviewing the Negative

Power items where utilization of skills and having influence with peers were issues, it is interpreted that male more than female principals isolated female teachers. Therefore male more than female principals were experienced by female teachers to discourage, manipulate, and isolate to achieve social control in schools.

Reviewing the Authority items where helping, modelling, and talking was measured, it is interpreted that female more than male principals mentored female teachers. Reviewing the Authority items where acknowledging and guiding occurred, it is interpreted that female more than male principals supported female teachers. Finally, reviewing the Authority items where memos were written, goal statements were developed, and notes of appreciation were given, it is interpreted that female more than male principals recognized female teachers. Therefore female more than male principals were experienced by female teachers to mentor, support, and recognize to achieve social control in schools.

Cross Gender Effects Indicated by Field Data

Since the survey data indicated significant cross gender effects for female teachers, it is instructive to analyze relevant observational and interview data obtained through shadowing principals on site. The field data were used to characterize the statistical findings that female teachers experienced male principals to be significantly more (1) discouraging, (2) manipulating, and (3) isolating compared to female principals. Consider these as follows:

(1) Male principals discouraged female teachers. For example, at a school site, a male principal was observed asking a female teacher, "Netta, have you got those books? I can't turn them in if I don't have them." (Name mine.) When the principal asked this he stuck his head out of his office into the public hallway and spoke in a loud and disparaging way. On reflection, the teacher confided to me that she felt "discouraged and patronized" by the principal. At another site, a male principal was observed to constantly cut female teachers off, completing their sentences when they spoke to him, leaving the teachers with feelings of anger, that "He wouldn't even hear me out!" The same principal was observed using the word "obviously" to introduce his point of view with female teachers: "Obviously, this is the way to submit the request." Female teachers felt that he discouraged them from thinking of alternative ways to do things.

(2) Male principals manipulated female teachers. For example, a female language teacher felt manipulated by her male principal after she requested his support to upgrade French textbooks but was told, "I don't know if I can get all the order you've requested ... it looks like $1,500 in orders here ... get the support of other language teachers for this order before I support it." During a follow up interview, the teacher felt "unsupported and manipulated," knowing that the principal did not want to buy the books but would not come out directly and say it. The principal left

her "the thankless task" to lobby for the books with her peers instead.

(3) Male principals isolated female teachers. For example, a female teacher felt isolated from a decision making process when her male principal "thoughtlessly" excluded her from a survey being taken of staff. Teachers were asked how to reward cooperative students on a monthly basis. By leaving the teacher out of the survey process, she felt the principal sent her a non-verbal message that her opinions and ideas were not valued like the rest of staff.

The following field data were used to characterize the statistical findings that female teachers experienced female principals to be significantly more (4) mentoring, (5) supporting, and (6) recognizing compared to male principals. Consider these as follows:

(4) Female principals mentored female teachers. For example, whenever a female teacher looked at her female principal during the supervision of her teaching, the principal responded by smiling openly and warmly. During a follow up interview, the teacher said she felt strengthened because of the principal's response. At the same site, talking to a female counsellor, the female principal was heard to take the time during a chaotic moment and say, "I'd appreciate your giving Jane and Marjorie as much help as possible as far as what is going on at Cook Elementary." (Names mine.) The principal showed a fundamental concern with mentoring for teachers not present, even in the midst

of some chaos; that the two teachers ought to have additional information so their work would be of the highest quality possible.

At another site, a female principal required information on the progress of a child and asked a female teacher to provide it. After the often interrupted discussion, the principal took the time to say, "I enjoyed it Deb. It will give me a clear picture about what we were discussing the other day." (Name mine.) The principal encouraged the teacher by expressing appreciation for the time and information she gave and by indicating how important the teacher's information was to her. The principal also expressed enjoyment working with the teacher, making her feel special.

(5) Female principals supported female teachers. A female principal showed concern that teachers have sufficient materials with which to do their work. For example, in one school, after showing a teacher materials that just arrived at the school, the female principal checked with her, "Do you want copies of the package for your own use?" Although this observation cannot be viewed as a gender related exchange, similar observations were not recorded where male principals offered support to teachers on a consistent basis.

At another site, a female principal was observed to ensure that everybody had the same information when dealing with a parent, "OK, I need to talk to Mrs Van Dyck and the

three of us need to talk together after." (Name mine.) The female principal supported her teachers and was careful to feed back technical information that would enhance their effectiveness.

(6) Female principals recognized female teachers. Female principals recognized female teacher achievements and abilities more than male principals. For example, female principals were observed to maintain "Thank You" cards and "Appreciation" cards in their desks and to send them frequently to teachers. They were observed to verbalize appreciation for work done by staff, too. Male principals were not observed to emphasize this aspect of communication with their teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

Teachers and Principals

Communication in schools may be described as principals and teachers constantly trying out new ways of expressing their expectations of each other. This study focussed on teacher experiences of principal communication. It was concluded that female teachers experienced principal communications differently than male teachers; that the differences were gender related. Since the present education system is dominated by female teachers and male principals, the findings in this study may be instructive to teachers and principals in their search to find better ways to communicate.

Implications for Leadership

What can be learned from these conclusions? Teachers and principals may focus on being clear and authentic with each other understanding how to balance positive and negative power communication strategies and how to use them when appropriate. The social control communication model partitions the orientation of communication three ways: personal orientation, official orientation, and structural orientation. Since one set of school expectations may be communicated personally, officially, and through organizational structures, clear communication of expectations is dependent upon the level of consistency or congruency perceived by members of the organization among the three orientations. In other words, teachers will better perceive school-organizational expectations if principals communicate consistently at all levels of orientations. Teachers will then experience the person the principal is, the role the principal plays, and structures the school manifests, as congruent. Such a school would feel genuine and welcoming to its teachers.

Principals must practice appropriate uses of social control communication. The use of all nine types of communications may be appropriate depending upon circumstances. Becoming aware of how to communicate may provide principals with a valuable leadership tool. Knowledge of communication strategies, their effect, and

when to use them may help principals be more effective leaders and make schools more relevant places for its members.

REFERENCES

Gougeon, T.D. (1989). Leadership as social control: Development of a high school principal leadership assessment instrument. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Washington State University.

Gougeon, T.D., S.I. Hutton, & J.L. McPherson. (1991). A quantitative phenomenological study of leadership: Social control theory applied to actions of school principals. The Journal of Thought. January. DeKalb IL: Northern Illinois University.

Seigel, S. (1956). Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A TEACHER RESPONSE FORM

APPENDIX B PRINCIPAL RESPONSE FORM

APPENDIX A
TEACHER RESPONSE FORM

(Copyright Gougeon 1990)

INSTRUCTIONS

To respond to the 90 COMMUNICATION ITEMS, begin each by thinking of the following: "MY PRINCIPAL COMMUNICATES WITH ME BY..." AND circle the appropriate number...

1 = never or not applicable
2 = once in a while
3 = generally
4 = most often
5 = all the time

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONS

1.	How many years of teaching experience have you?	_ _ years
2.	Are you male? female?	M F (circle)
3.	What is your age?	_ _ years
4.	Count the number of principals you have worked with...	_ _
5.	How close would you describe yourself to your principal? (1=not very close; 5=very close)	1 2 3 4 5
6.	How many years have you worked with your present principal?	_ _ years
7.	How often do you interact professionally with your principal? (1=never; 5=all the time)	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Estimate the number of times per day you cross paths with your principal?	_ _ _times
9.	Have you raised or are you raising children of your own?	YES NO (circle)
10.	Do you teach courses in Language Arts, Social Studies, or the Social Sciences such as Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, History, or Economics?	YES NO (circle)
11.	Is your school rural? urban?	R U (circle)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

"MY PRINCIPAL COMMUNICATES WITH ME BY..."
1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

1.	Developing close personal relationships with me.	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Helping me learn the ropes.	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Making me feel recognized during public meetings.	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Including me in decision making.	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Making me feel unsupported when I make mistakes.	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Assigning me desirable duties in recognition of my effectiveness.	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Making me feel upset that I did not meet expectations of my job.	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Giving me praise or encouragement.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Making me feel isolated from my colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Knowing me well on an individual and personal basis.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Directly acknowledging me when I contribute to the operation.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	Making me feel acknowledged with memos or newsletter articles.	1 2 3 4 5
13.	Involving me in planning.	1 2 3 4 5
14.	Making me feel confronted when I fail to meet set standards.	1 2 3 4 5
15.	Publicly recognizing my achievements.	1 2 3 4 5
16.	Being frank and honest with me in addressing disagreements.	1 2 3 4 5
17.	Encouraging me to accept roles in the school which have high visibility in the community.	1 2 3 4 5

"MY PRINCIPAL COMMUNICATES WITH ME BY..."

1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

18.	Making me feel unrecognized for the work I am doing .	1 2 3 4 5
19.	Making me feel valued.	1 2 3 4 5
20.	Guiding me to learn better work related skills.	1 2 3 4 5
21.	Setting professional goals with me using written goal statements.	1 2 3 4 5
22.	Giving me more freedom to make decisions.	1 2 3 4 5
23.	Confronting me when I perform unreliably.	1 2 3 4 5
24.	Responding to my personal needs when I need it.	1 2 3 4 5
25.	Making me feel uncomfortable when I am uncooperative.	1 2 3 4 5
26.	Giving me expanded areas of responsibility.	1 2 3 4 5
27.	Making me feel generally unfulfilled in my work.	1 2 3 4 5
28.	Making me feel cared about.	1 2 3 4 5
29.	Making me feel fairly treated during supervision on my work.	1 2 3 4 5
30.	Involving me in program development.	1 2 3 4 5
31.	Encouraging me to develop ideas for changes.	1 2 3 4 5
32.	Discouraging me from developing innovations.	1 2 3 4 5
33.	Supporting my budget requests.	1 2 3 4 5
34.	Making me feel the need to follow rules more closely than I often do.	1 2 3 4 5
35.	Making me feel I have influence and leadership capabilities in my program area.	1 2 3 4 5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"MY PRINCIPAL COMMUNICATES WITH ME BY..."

1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

36.	Making me think that my skills are not being utilized.	1 2 3 4 5
37.	Finding time to spend with me during work hours.	1 2 3 4 5
38.	Making me feel supported when I try new ideas or programs.	1 2 3 4 5
39.	Bringing rules and regulations to my attention.	1 2 3 4 5
40.	Helping me feel important.	1 2 3 4 5
41.	Making sure I am accountable for my conduct.	1 2 3 4 5
42.	Approving of my after-hours work activities.	1 2 3 4 5
43.	Making me feel left out of the decision making process.	1 2 3 4 5
44.	Providing me additional responsibilities for high achievement.	1 2 3 4 5
45.	Trying to limit the amount of influence I have with colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
46.	Helping me improve my work performance.	1 2 3 4 5
47.	Making me feel secure that I am meeting legal or regulatory requirements.	1 2 3 4 5
48.	Making me feel supported when I work after hours.	1 2 3 4 5
49.	Telling me how important my work is.	1 2 3 4 5
50.	Clearly showing it when he\she is angry.	1 2 3 4 5
51.	Acknowledging my efforts at meetings.	1 2 3 4 5

"MY PRINCIPAL COMMUNICATES WITH ME BY..."
1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

52.	Making me feel uncertain whether I am doing as well as others in my work.	1 2 3 4 5
53.	Officially advocating for my career advancement.	1 2 3 4 5
54.	Making me feel discouraged when I am trying something new.	1 2 3 4 5
55.	Modeling techniques for me to follow.	1 2 3 4 5
56.	Assigning me to duties that I feel comfortable with.	1 2 3 4 5
57.	Routinely talking to me about my work.	1 2 3 4 5
58.	Letting me feel admired for my work.	1 2 3 4 5
59.	Making me aware that support for me is limited.	1 2 3 4 5
60.	Praising me when I develop my own ideas at work.	1 2 3 4 5
61.	Making me feel unreasonably treated.	1 2 3 4 5
62.	Helping me obtain special assistance.	1 2 3 4 5
63.	Making me feel unrecognized for my achievements.	1 2 3 4 5
64.	Sharing hopes and aspirations with me.	1 2 3 4 5
65.	Delegating responsibilities to me based upon my strengths.	1 2 3 4 5
66.	Making me feel supported when I am involved in work related ceremonial functions.	1 2 3 4 5
67.	Granting me additional responsibilities.	1 2 3 4 5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"MY PRINCIPAL COMMUNICATES WITH ME BY..."
1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

68.	Making me think that receiving a greater share of the budget depends on how I perform in my job.	1 2 3 4 5
69.	Advising me how to be more successful in my career.	1 2 3 4 5
70.	Making me feel I am being deprived of resources I need to do my job.	1 2 3 4 5
71.	Encouraging me to take challenging but rewarding jobs at work.	1 2 3 4 5
72.	Ignoring ideas I offered to planning committees.	1 2 3 4 5
73.	Taking time to sit down and to talk with me.	1 2 3 4 5
74.	Explaining ways of doing things when I want or need explanation.	1 2 3 4 5
75.	Writing notes to me in appreciation of work well done.	1 2 3 4 5
76.	Letting me feel part of his\her hopes and dreams.	1 2 3 4 5
77.	Showing anger whenever he\she is angry.	1 2 3 4 5
78.	Supporting my involvement with outside organizations relevant to my work.	1 2 3 4 5
79.	Making me feel less important than others.	1 2 3 4 5
80.	Adapting organizational procedures when I find them awkward to follow.	1 2 3 4 5
81.	Making me feel unfairly assigned to duties at work.	1 2 3 4 5
82.	Making me feel comfortable when he\she talks with me.	1 2 3 4 5
83.	Developing professional inservice for me and others.	1 2 3 4 5

"MY PRINCIPAL COMMUNICATES WITH ME BY..."

1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

84.	Asking for my support of new program initiatives.	1 2 3 4 5
85.	Giving me personal support when I do good work.	1 2 3 4 5
86.	Making me feel responsible when I am not doing well at work.	1 2 3 4 5
87.	Encouraging me to develop leadership skills in my area.	1 2 3 4 5
88.	Making me feel punished.	1 2 3 4 5
89.	Writing notes of thanks to me when I complete major tasks.	1 2 3 4 5
90.	Recording my work at a level less than I think it is in written reports.	1 2 3 4 5

THANK YOU.
YOU HAVE COMPLETED
THE
PRINCIPAL
COMMUNICATION
PATTERNS
DIAGNOSTIC
INSTRUMENT

If you wish general information about the design of the diagnostic instrument or specific information about the theoretical basis behind the question items, please write me at the address on the front cover of this booklet.

Dr. Thomas D. Gougeon

APPENDIX B
PRINCIPAL RESPONSE FORM

(Copyright Gougeon 1990)

INSTRUCTIONS

To respond to the 90 COMMUNICATION ITEMS, begin each by thinking of the following: "I COMMUNICATE WITH MY TEACHERS BY..." AND circle the appropriate number...

1 = never or not applicable
2 = once in a while
3 = generally
4 = most often
5 = all the time

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONS

1.	How many years of teaching experience did you have before entering administration?	_ _years
2.	What number of years of administration experience do you have?	_ _years
3.	Are you male? Female?	M F (Circle)
4.	What is your age?	_ _years
5.	Counting this principalship, what is the total number of principalships you have held?	_ _ (Positions)
6.	What is the lowest grade in your school?	_ _grade
7.	What is the highest grade in your school?	_ _grade
8.	How many certified teachers do you supervise?	_ _ _certs
9.	How many school buildings are you responsible for?	_ _
10.	What is the total enrolment of your school(s)?	_ _ _ _
11.	Do you consider your school to be rural? urban?	R U (Circle)
12.	How many years have you worked in this school?	_ _years

COMMUNICATION ITEMS

"I COMMUNICATE WITH MY TEACHERS BY..."

1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

1.	Developing close personal relationships with them.	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Helping them learn the ropes.	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Recognizing them during public meetings.	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Including them in decision making.	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Withdrawing some support from them when they make mistakes.	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Assigning them desired duties in recognition of their effectiveness.	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Telling them when they do not meet my expectations.	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Giving them praise or encouragement.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Isolating them from undesirable colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Knowing them well on an individual and personal basis.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Directly acknowledging them when they contribute to the operation.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	Acknowledging them in memos or newsletters.	1 2 3 4 5
13.	Involving them in planning.	1 2 3 4 5
14.	Confronting them when they fail to meet set standards.	1 2 3 4 5
15.	Publicly recognizing their achievements.	1 2 3 4 5
16.	Being frank and honest with them in addressing disagreements.	1 2 3 4 5
17.	Encouraging them to take on highly visible roles.	1 2 3 4 5

"I COMMUNICATE WITH MY TEACHERS BY..."

1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

18.	Withholding support from them for appearing unprofessional.	1 2 3 4 5
19.	Valuing them as worthwhile people.	1 2 3 4 5
20.	Guiding them to learn better professional skills.	1 2 3 4 5
21.	Setting professional goals with them using written goal statements.	1 2 3 4 5
22.	Giving them more freedom to make decisions.	1 2 3 4 5
23.	Confronting them when they perform unreliably.	1 2 3 4 5
24.	Granting them personal requests.	1 2 3 4 5
25.	Withholding privileges from them.	1 2 3 4 5
26.	Giving effective teachers expanded areas of responsibility.	1 2 3 4 5
27.	Pointing out when they are habitually negative toward their work.	1 2 3 4 5
28.	Caring about them.	1 2 3 4 5
29.	Emphasizing the positive during my supervision of their work.	1 2 3 4 5
30.	Involving them in program development.	1 2 3 4 5
31.	Encouraging them to develop new ideas.	1 2 3 4 5
32.	Discouraging them from being too scattered in their work.	1 2 3 4 5
33.	Supporting their requests for supplies and equipment.	1 2 3 4 5
34.	Encouraging them to follow rules more often.	1 2 3 4 5
35.	Giving them more influence as their leadership skills develop.	1 2 3 4 5
36.	Discouraging them from working at levels past their capabilities.	1 2 3 4 5

"I COMMUNICATE WITH MY TEACHERS BY..."

1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

37.	Finding time to spend with them during work hours.	1 2 3 4 5
38.	Supporting them when they are trying out new ideas.	1 2 3 4 5
39.	Bringing rules and regulations to their attention when needed.	1 2 3 4 5
40.	Helping them to feel important.	1 2 3 4 5
41.	Making certain they are accountable for their conduct.	1 2 3 4 5
42.	Talking to them about their after hours work activities.	1 2 3 4 5
43.	Excluding them from my management team if they are negative.	1 2 3 4 5
44.	Giving them additional responsibilities depending on their ability to accept them.	1 2 3 4 5
45.	Limiting the amount of influence they might have with colleagues.	1 2 3 4 5
46.	Helping them improve their performance.	1 2 3 4 5
47.	Advising them of legal or regulatory requirements.	1 2 3 4 5
48.	Supporting them when they work after hours.	1 2 3 4 5
49.	Telling them how important their work is.	1 2 3 4 5
50.	Clearly showing it when I get angry at them.	1 2 3 4 5
51.	Acknowledging their efforts at meetings.	1 2 3 4 5
52.	Giving them more support when they are positive than when they are negative.	1 2 3 4 5
53.	Advocating their career advancement when they deserve it.	1 2 3 4 5

"I COMMUNICATE WITH MY TEACHERS BY..."
1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

54.	Discouraging them from moving into new areas when they have yet to be successful in their present ones.	1 2 3 4 5
55.	Modeling techniques for them to follow.	1 2 3 4 5
56.	Assigning them duties that they appropriate to their skills.	1 2 3 4 5
57.	Making a routine of talking to them about their work.	1 2 3 4 5
58.	Showing admiration for their work when it is outstanding.	1 2 3 4 5
59.	Limiting my administrative support when it is deserved.	1 2 3 4 5
60.	Praising their good work.	1 2 3 4 5
61.	Turning down requests which seem unreasonable.	1 2 3 4 5
62.	Helping them obtain special assistance when needed.	1 2 3 4 5
63.	Withholding recognition of their contributions for any reason.	1 2 3 4 5
64.	Sharing hopes and aspirations with them.	1 2 3 4 5
65.	Clearly getting commitments from them when they agree to do extra work.	1 2 3 4 5
66.	Supporting their involvement in work-related ceremonial functions.	1 2 3 4 5
67.	Showing respect for their points of view.	1 2 3 4 5
68.	Being impatient when they "beat around the bush" and not state their points clearly.	1 2 3 4 5
69.	Advising them how to be more successful in their careers.	1 2 3 4 5

"I COMMUNICATE WITH MY TEACHERS BY..."
1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

70.	Creating hardships for those who are not compliant.	1 2 3 4 5
71.	Encouraging them to take challenging but rewarding tasks at work.	1 2 3 4 5
72.	Redirecting discussions when they seem irrelevant.	1 2 3 4 5
73.	Taking time to sit down to talk with them during the working day.	1 2 3 4 5
74.	Explaining ways of doing things when they want or need it.	1 2 3 4 5
75.	Writing notes of appreciation to them for work well done.	1 2 3 4 5
76.	Sharing my personal hopes and dreams with them.	1 2 3 4 5
77.	Clearly showing anger when I am angry with them.	1 2 3 4 5
78.	Supporting their involvement with outside organizations related to their jobs.	1 2 3 4 5
79.	Removing responsibilities from them and handing them over to others.	1 2 3 4 5
80.	Adapting organizational procedures when it becomes clear that they are awkward to follow.	1 2 3 4 5
81.	Giving them duties they may construe to be punitive.	1 2 3 4 5
82.	Using a comfortable and informal manner.	1 2 3 4 5
83.	Developing professional inservice for them.	1 2 3 4 5
84.	Asking for their support of new program initiatives.	1 2 3 4 5

"I COMMUNICATE WITH MY TEACHERS BY..."

1 = NEVER / NOT APPLICABLE
2 = ONCE IN A WHILE
3 = GENERALLY
4 = MOST OFTEN
5 = ALL THE TIME

85.	Giving them personal support when they do good work.	1 2 3 4 5
86.	Making them responsible for work that is being done poorly.	1 2 3 4 5
87.	Giving them leadership responsibilities over others at work.	1 2 3 4 5
88.	Officially assigning them punitive tasks when they deserve it.	1 2 3 4 5
89.	Writing notes of thanks to them when they complete major tasks.	1 2 3 4 5
90.	Writing "unsatisfactory" reports on their work when they deserve them.	1 2 3 4 5

THANK YOU.
YOU HAVE COMPLETED
THE
PRINCIPAL
COMMUNICATION
PATTERNS
DIAGNOSTIC
INSTRUMENT

If you wish general information about the design of the diagnostic instrument or specific information about the theoretical basis behind the question items, please write me at the address on the front cover of this booklet.

Dr. Thomas D. Gougeon